UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

TY JESSE MYNATT,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 1:20-cv-02759-JPH-TAB
MICHELLE LEE WALL,)
Defendant.)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiff Ty Jesse Mynatt has filed a complaint against attorney Michelle Lee Wall, asserting constitutional claims. *See* dkt. 1. After screening this complaint, the Court determined that it failed to state a claim and ordered Mr. Mynatt to show cause why it should not be dismissed. Dkt. 4 at 4–5. Mr. Mynatt filed a "Motion to Amend/Add to Complaint," dkt. [5], which the Court construes as a response to its show-cause order. Because Mr. Mynatt's filing still does not show that his complaint states a claim, the Court **DENIES** the motion to amend and **DISMISSES** his complaint.

II. Analysis

Mr. Mynatt brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim against his former attorney, Michelle Lee Wall, alleging that she "violated multiple of [his] constitutional rights of 'Due Process' by showing 'bias, prejudice, and retaliation.'" Dkt. 1 at 2. However, the Court's screening order concluded that Mr. Mynatt's complaint had not alleged that Ms. Wall acted under color of state law as required. Dkt. 4 at 4 (citing Abatangelo v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 719

F. App'x 520, 524 (7th Cir. 2017) ("State action is an element of any claim under § 1983.")).

In his response, Mr. Mynatt claims that his complaint alleged an "act of conspiracy and collusion to deprive" him "of his constitutional rights under the . . . color of law." Dkt. 5 at 1. To support this conclusion, he alleges that Ms. Wall "threatened [him] into signing a Plea-Bargain" by stating that she had "worked for the Judge for [the] past 20 years and [he] better sign this plea bargain." *Id*.

"To establish § 1983 liability through a conspiracy" against a private actor, "a plaintiff must establish that: (1) a state official and private individual[] reached an understanding to deprive the plaintiff of his constitutional rights; and (2) those individuals were willful participants in joint activity with the State or its agents." Logan v. Wilkins, 644 F.3d 577, 583 (7th Cir. 2011). But Mr. Mynatt has not alleged an "understanding" between Ms. Wall and any state actor, let alone "willful" participation in a "joint activity." See id. Ms. Wall's alleged statement about her employment history cannot support a finding that Ms. Wall acted within a state conspiracy. Even if Ms. Wall's alleged past employment affected her decision to urge Mr. Mynatt to sign the plea agreement, that is not enough to allege a conspiracy under § 1983. See Tarkowski v. Robert Bartlett Realty Co., 644 F.2d 1204, 1208 (7th Cir. 1980) ("Mere conjecture that there has been a conspiracy is not enough to state a claim."); Murray v. Carlson, No. 4:11-CV-42-SEB-TAB, 2013 WL 5874740, at *4 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 30, 2013) ("[A]n allegation merely using the term 'conspiracy,'

cannot, absent reference to material facts, survive a motion to dismiss."). Without plausibly alleging state action on his § 1983 claims, Mr. Mynatt's complaint must still be **DISMISSED** for failure to state a claim.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, the Court **DENIES** Mr. Mynatt's motion, dkt [5], and **DISMISSES** his complaint. Final judgment shall issue in a separate entry.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 12/4/2020

James Patrick Hanlon
United States District Judge
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

TY JESSE MYNATT
714543
MARION COUNTY JAIL II
MARION COUNTY JAIL II
Inmate Mail/Parcels
730 East Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46202